Dave Beck and the 5th Amendment, P. 4

Eastland's "Who Me?" Testimony In A Freedom-of-the Press Contempt Trial, P. 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 13 APRIL 1, 1957 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Naught So Misguided As Those Missiles

What was so appalling about the Bermuda conference was not the meagreness of the results but the mendacity of the final communique. In putting their names to it, Eisenhower and Macmillan testified to a cynical contempt for the intelligence of their own people. The real agreements in the joint statement were not new and the new agreements were not real. The decision to give Britain nuclear missiles was reached in the Wilson-Sandys talks at the beginning of February, and the decision to join the military committee of the Baghdad Pact was made several weeks before Bermuda. The "accords" reaffirming support for the reunification of the Germans in the sweet bye-and-bye, and of sympathy for the Hungarians will only infuriate both; these phrases mask the old lazy-minded unwillingness to do anything for either people by negotiation and diplomacy. As for the Middle East, the best commentary on those accords was the one word answer of Secretary Dulles at press conference last week when asked whether any instructions had yet been given U.S. vessels on where and to whom their Suez tolls are to be paid. His answer was "No". If no decision has been registered on that elementary a point, what reason is there to believe any have been arrived at on the more complex issues?

A Mindless Momentum

The joint communique was most floozy where the problem was most grave, that of responding to world-wide anxiety about nuclear tests. All Eisenhower and Macmillan offered was a willingness to register with the United Nations advance notice of their tests and "permit limited international observation" if the Soviet Union would do the same. The rest was only a joint reiteration of the sham "intention to conduct nuclear tests only in such manner as will keep world radiation from rising to more than a small fraction of the levels that might be hazardous." This, as the ordinarily pro-Eisenhower *Washington Post* pointed out, "accepts the optimistic view that the tests are doing no harm, although no one really knows and . . . is designed to sanction new British thermonuclear tests as well as to dignify the doubletalk about the American 'clean' bomb." The truth is that the U.S. seems to be doing exactly what AEC Commissioner Murray warned against in his address last November to the Catholic Association for International Peace: "we allow weapons technology to control the weapons program . . . and the stockpiled results of the weapons program to control military policies." We continue testing to make "better" if not larger bombs; we give no real thought as to whether they can ever be used without world suicide; but since the stockpiles grow bigger we "economize" by equipping our own and allied armies with them in a kind of mindless momentum which could carry us all toward the final catastrophe.

For the British people the communique must be doubly disappointing. They had hoped that Macmillan would win some of those concessions on freer trade with China which Eisenhower promised Eden to study 14 months ago. Apparently Macmillan was unable to persuade Eisenhower to join him even in the most generalized accord looking toward the lightening of cold war restrictions on trade between East and West. The other eloquently blank space in the communique was the absence of any reference to Britain's desire for military retrenchment, particularly in regard to her occupation forces in Germany. Instead the statement said that in the interest of "mutual economy" certain guided missiles would be made available to Britain by the U.S. But it is doubtful that this will prove an economy to either; missiles are expensive to produce and expensive to man. This gift will cost Britain many millions of dollars in additional arms expenditure. Other costs may prove more serious. Britain, living beyond its income, needs relaxation of world tension in order to reduce her arms burden and increase her trade. To establish nuclear missile bases capable of bombing Moscow will be to step up tension. The British people ask for bread, and we give them guided missiles.

Down The Steep Slope to War

Nothing could be more misguided than these missiles we intend to put into mass production and then parcel out among our allies. They may make the drift toward war irreversible; they will certainly make it harder to be certain that small wars do not expand into the big one, as the missiles fall into more and more hands. We are indeed acting as if war were inevitable. We are establishing forward bases, deploying our navies, preparing bases for our air fleets. We are waging economic warfare. We are digging deeper all the terrible divisions of the world—of Germany and Europe; of Korea, China, Indochina and East Asia; and by joining the Baghdad Pact, of the Middle East. We have set our faces against any negotiation with the other big power of the world; we have downgraded disarmament to a minor sideshow no one takes seriously. Everywhere this process is impoverishing mankind; wasting manpower and materials with which a start might be made on the world's poverty. With the arms race and the cold war comes creeping inflation; it makes its appearance even here in the highest peacetime budget of our history. The voice of Nehru pleading for Russo-American negotiation is drowned out in our press; every effort of the Russians to negotiate is howled down. This is not responsible conduct. Eisenhower said last year that war is now "preposterous." But if war is preposterous, should we not shore up the precarious foundations of peace instead of piling up and handing out ever deadlier arms?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Syngman Rhee Campaigns to End the Korean Armistice and Obtain Atomic Arms

Army Chief of Staff Contradicts Expert Senate Report on Korea

For some time Syngman Rhee has been campaigning for abrogation of the Korean armistice and for the equipment of the South Korean forces with atomic weapons. His Defense Minister is in Washington lobbying for those objectives, and Rhee seems to have succeeded in utilizing one of those special Senate reports on the foreign aid program for his purposes.

The report made by Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, a former Assistant Secretary of State, on Korea, Japan, Formosa and the Philippines recommends that the U.S. ignore the armistice agreement ban on modernizing South Korea's military forces. This could be a first step toward resumption of the war.

Dr. Hannah drew a somber picture of the military situation in Korea. He said the UN forces had continued to comply with the terms of the armistice, which specifies that old equipment may be replaced only by equipment of the same type. "In consequence," his report said, "we now have there an assortment of largely obsolete World War II type military weapons."

The Communists, on the other hand, are accused of having "openly, flagrantly and continuously violated the terms of the armistice", building new airfields and moving large quantities of jets into North Korea.

Another Syngman Rhee Whopper?

Syngman Rhee's Defense Minister told reporters here that last December North Korea trained five divisions in nuclear warfare in maneuvers near the armistice line. Since Dr. Hannah's report was released three months later, it is strange that it makes no mention of so striking a violation of the armistice agreement. Judging by Syngman Rhee's past record for alarmism and unreliability, and judging also by the distrust which Peking and Moscow both have always shown for the North Korean forces (like the South notoriously trigger-happy), I am inclined to think this report a pure and simple "whopper."

Even Dr. Hannah's more moderate view of the situation in Korea has now been contradicted by the Army Chief of Staff. Three days after the release of the Hannah report, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, arrived in South Korea on a tour of inspection. Gen. Taylor knows Korea well, since he was Eighth Army and UN Commander before becoming Chief of Staff.

What Gen. Taylor had to say about the equipment of the South Korean forces is in flat contradiction to Dr. Hannah's report. A dispatch from Seoul in the *New York Times* of March 22 reported, "When asked whether the Communist military buildup in North Korea endangered the UN forces in Korea, General Taylor said, 'No, I think the United Nations forces are thoroughly equipped."

Formosa as Seen From Madison Avenue

Unfortunately the interview with Gen. Taylor was a special dispatch which got only a few paragraphs in the Late City Edition of the *New York Times* that day while the Hannah report's recommendations were carried by the wire services. How many Senators reading the Hannah report will be aware of how flatly it was contradicted by the Army Chief of Staff?

Giving atomic arms to Syngman Rhee would be a recipe for serious trouble. He has been anxious for resumption of the war, and like his comrade-in-arms, Chiang Kai-shek, would be willing to set off another world war if it suited his purpose. Dr. Hannah and Gen. Taylor both ought to be questioned by the special Senate Committee on Foreign Aid, and the former in particular ought to be asked whether he meant atomic arms when he said the South Korean forces should be given "the most modern equipment."

These reports are supposed to be expert studies for the guidance of the Senate and the public, not bits of special pleading. Dr. Hannah's dithyrambs on Chiang Kai-shek's forces do not inspire confidence in his objectivity. "Free China," he reported, "is a better military and economic risk than Americans have been led to believe. . . . Our military feel that the Chinese Nationalists are an effective military force. They have a burning desire to return to the Chinese mainland. . . . Assistance to this forces is a good military investment." Is this a serious report, or an advertising brochure?

Korea Costing Billion A Year

The total amount of military assistance to Korea has long been treated as secret information, but a footnote on page 73 of a Senate foreign aid report released March 21 on "The Military Assistance Program of the United States" reveals "the United States is now spending—on the Korean forces and the Korean economy, and on our own and United Nations forces—at a rate of more than a billion dollars a year. . . ."

Some other interesting glimpses of Korean realities can be pieced together from this report. At page 119: "The Republic of Korea has 21 divisions which cost the U. S. more than 700 million dollars a year and absorb a great deal of Korean manpower of the age group most needed for essential economic activities."

At page 54: "Some Asian leaders, Syngman Rhee being an outstanding example, have sought to build or maintain much larger armed forces than the United States has thought necessary." And at page 68, "Some of our allies have demonstrated that they are not in perfect accord with, nor perfectly responsive to, American preferences on certain important questions. The ambition of President Rhee, of South Korea, to reunify his country with American trained and equipped forces and the hopes of Generalissimo Chiang to return to the mainland are examples of areas of nonconsensus in which allies become more likely to act on their own initiative as their military power increases."

Korean Economic and Political Realities Peep Through Dr. Hannah's Report

"President Rhee effectively holds the reins of power and personally makes most of the Government's decisions. At times this has been advantageous to the United States, for he has been able to hold his government together on a strongly anti-Communist basis. On the other hand, his extreme anti-Japanese attitude has made difficult the development of more satisfactory Korean-Japanese relationships.

"Since there is an acute shortage of experienced people to manage its affairs, the Government is relatively inefficient and often indecisive. Government officials are grossly underpaid and with resulting temptations for graft and corruption.

"The military program has an important relation to the economic situation of the country. Over 50 percent of the national Republic of Korea budget is for military purposes. Reduction of military expenditures, if that ever becomes feasible, would reduce governmental expenditures and make additional resources, including mechanical and other skills, available for developmental purposes. . . .

"As long as the country is divided, and as long as it is necessary to devote so large a share of its national income to military purposes, it is an open question as to how long it will be before Korea can become economically self-supporting."

—Korea, Japan, Taiwan and the Philippines, Survey No. 5, U.S. Foreign Assistance Programs, by Dr. John A. Hannah.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Morse and His Fellow Senators Throw A Two Day Legalistic Fit on Immunity

But They Act as Rubber Stamps for Eastland in Freedom of the Press Cases

The Constitution exempts members of Congress from arrest, except on criminal charges, while their respective Houses are in session. The effect is to make them immune from subpoena as witnesses while Congress is sitting since they cannot be arrested for failure to appear. This was recalled when Federal Judge Luther Youngdahl granted the defense a subpoena for Senator Eastland in the trial of Seymour Peck. Peck, a member of the staff of the *New York Times*, was convicted of contempt for refusing on First Amendment grounds to answer questions in the Senate Internal Security committee investigation of alleged Communist infiltration into the press.

At first Senator Eastland pleaded that he could not appear because he had the gout. Then he appealed to the Senate when Judge Youngdahl declined on motion of the prosecution to quash the subpoena. The refusal to quash placed Eastland in a quandary. The Judge made it clear that, of course, he could not force the Senator to appear. On the other hand, if the Senator failed to appear, the Judge could dismiss the case on the ground that the non-appearance of Eastland had deprived the defense of full opportunity to prove its case. The heart of that case was that the Committee, in embarking on an investigation of the press, was in violation of the First Amendment. The defense wanted to prove this from the testimony of Eastland as Committee chairman.

The Senate thereupon spent most of two days debating whether to vote a resolution permitting Eastland to appear, and finally decided to drop the resolution altogether and allow him to appear—as Senators usually appear—voluntarily. The main cause of the long and tedious debate lay in the ostentatious and legalistic objections of Senator Morse, who blocked unanimous consent the first day, making a great show of constitutional qualms.

Loquacity Now, But Silence Then

The immunity of Senators from arrest during a session is an important safeguard of government, though one not really at stake here since Judge Youngdahl had no intention of trying to arrest the Senator. But freedom of the press is at least as important as senatorial immunity. Yet the same Senators last year approved with no discussion whatsoever the contempt citations requested by Senator Eastland in the Peck case and others arising out of his press investigation.

Why was Senator Morse silent then? Where was all his legal learning? What happened then to his meticulous concern for every jot and tittle of the Constitution? Is the Senate supposed to be a rubber stamp and vote contempt citations with no concern for its own constitutional obligations? Or does Morse save his erudite histrionics for those occasions when he can be on Eastland's side? We wish some of our readers in Oregon would put these questions up to Senator Morse, and the silent junior Senator from Oregon, Neuberger, who seems to have forgotten completely that he was a newspaperman himself once.

Does Senator Eastland Really Believe in Hobgoblins?

Aside from giving the Senator a chance to explain lamely that he had no intention of investigating the press (see box below), the chief feature of Eastland's cross-examination by Defense Counsel Telford Taylor was the apparent gullibility of the Internal Security Committee chairman.

In explaining why the Committee had subpoenaed Miss Matilda Landsman, a linotypist on the *New York Times*, the Senator said "We had information that she had downgraded herself in employment, taken a job at less salary in New York to be in a position to direct and assist in taking over Local No. 6 of the Typographical Union . . . the biggest local in the country."

The fact is that Miss Landsman far from "downgrading" herself increased her income from 50 to 75 percent in moving from a secretarial job to a linotypist. And who sold the Senator the idea that an ex-secretary could take over one of the most conservative unions in the country?

Eastland was also cross-examined about the David Fine bookstore, which was brought out of obscurity in order to smear Fine's brother on the *New York Times*. Eastland was asked to explain the many questions by the Committee about the political content of publications that bookstore sold. Was this not an inquiry into ideas?

"Well," the Senator said, "I remember there was such a bookshop in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, I believe it was, that we were able to get information on it by questions exactly like that. We developed the fact that the Communist underground, in case of war with Russia, in the Southern States would be located back of that bookshop. . . ."

Wouldn't a conservative bookstore be a better blind?

Senator Eastland Testifies There Was Nobody There But Us Chickens

Q. Well, I understood that in answer to one of Mr. [William] Hitz' [Assistant U. S. Attorney] questions you said that you did not try to find out whether the content of the press had been affected by infiltration.

A. That is correct. . . .

Q. Well, I would like then to ask you to comment on this colloquy between yourself and Senator Hennings that Mr. Hitz has already referred to. . . . where Senator Hennings says, "And I think, too, it should be clear that the best evidence of any subversion or infiltration into any news-dispensing agency or opinion-forming journal is certainly the product itself." And you say, "That is correct."

A. Well, that is correct.

Q. What?

A. That is correct. But that was not the matter that we were investigating. . . .

Q. I will ask you to look a little further down. . . . right in the middle there, the long statement by Senator Hennings. . . . "that this is not an attack upon any one newspaper, upon any group of newspapers as such, but an effort on the part of this Committee to show such participation and such attempt as may be disclosed on the part of the Communist Party in the U. S. or elsewhere, indeed, to influence or subvert the American press." . . .

A. At the time he said that, now, I noticed that when I read it. At the time he said that I didn't catch the significance of what he said. . . .

Q. You did say that that was a very fine and very accurate statement, didn't you?

A. Yes, sir, but I said I didn't catch—you can read that out of context. . . . I understood what he was going to say that he was going to make it very plain that we were not investigating any newspaper. . . . That we were not attempting in any way to infringe upon freedom of the press. . . .

Q. Senator, isn't it a fact that in the course of these very hearings, after this colloquy, that a number of the witnesses were asked about the actual slanting and distortion of the press by Communists?

A. I don't recall.

—Senator Eastland, in the Seymour Peck contempt case.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why the AFL-CIO Ought to Fire Him As A Vice-President

Dave Beck and The Fifth Amendment

As a citizen of the United States, Dave Beck has a right to invoke the Fifth amendment. On trial, his invocation of the Fifth cannot be used against him as inference of guilt. So much is clear. But does he have a right to remain a trade union official when he refuses to explain secret financial transactions with representatives of employers at the expense of union funds? This is the question raised by Beck's disgusting performance before the McClellan committee.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt was Governor of New York he removed Sheriff Thomas M. Farley of New York County after the Seabury investigation disclosed the vast sums deposited by the Sheriff in excess of his salary.

"As a matter of general sound public policy," Roosevelt ruled as Governor, ". . . there is a requirement that where a public official is under inquiry or investigation . . . and it appears that his scale of living, or the total of his bank deposits far exceeds the public salary which he is known to receive, he . . . owes a positive public duty to the community to give a reasonable or credible explanation of the sources of the deposits, or the source which entitles him to maintain a scale of living beyond the amount of his salary."

The Teamsters Would Never Have Known

We believe the principle applies equally to leaders of labor unions. They exercise vast power today in their own realms; they can deprive men of their livelihood by expelling them from union membership; they can by legal manipulation and physical intimidation prevent internal questioning of their conduct; they easily perpetuate themselves in office; huge pension and welfare funds are at the mercy of their sense of stewardship.

There is no doubt that Congress has full power to legislate in employer-employe relations, and to regulate the affairs of non-profit associations like labor unions. There is no doubt that the McClellan investigation has been lawfully accorded power to investigate. There is also no doubt that if there had been no investigation the average teamster and the average worker and the average citizen would never have known that Beck had been borrowing interest-free and secretly—as he admitted over the air—from his union treasury. Nor would they have known of the unethical relationship to which Shefferman testified.

When a labor leader in Beck's position, confronted with checks he signed and testimony of a man with whom he dealt, invokes the Fifth, what does the labor movement do? Give him a medal?

This Is Not A Witch Hunt

It is stretching the Fifth amendment beyond all reasonable bounds to hold that Beck not only has a right to invoke it against legal prosecution, but even against the consequences of the disclosure ethically required by his quasi-public position and the trustee relation he occupies in relation to his union. No one is suggesting that he be sent to jail for invoking the Fifth. But the AFL-CIO Council will do the labor movement a service if it fires him as a Vice-President, as I believe it will in the meeting called just before this went to press.

It is nonsense to argue that Congress has no right of exposure. Where it can legislate, it can "expose." Three generations of social reform in this country have been made possible by Congressional investigations exposing "malefactors of great wealth" and laying the basis for legislative check upon their power. From the anti-trust laws to the Wagner Act, this was how reform was brought about. These porcine racketeers who plunder and oppress the worker through the very instrumentalities designed for his protection are as great an evil. We applaud George Meany and Walter Reuther for standing up against them.

The fight against the witch hunt must be fought on more fundamental lines. To reverse the familiar metaphor, there is no need to burn down the barn of Congressional investigation in order to save a few rats. The witch hunt is unconstitutional because there two Congressional committees, in violation of the First amendment, are seeking to investigate ideas and political associations that are no business of government in a free society. The invocation of the Fifth amendment in such an inquiry stands on a different footing from the invocation of the Fifth by Dave Beck in a proper Congressional investigation long overdue.

Next Week: The California Bar Condemns The House Un-American Activities Committee

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....
4/1/57

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 301 E. Capitol St., Washington 3, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED